



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MOHONK CONFERENCE ADDRESSES.

Steps towards Arbitration.

BY REV. H. M. MACCRACKEN, D.D., CHANCELLOR
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

Mr. President,—In this my first attendance upon the Mohonk Conference, I wish to express my obligation to this Conference for the impulse it has given me. We who have placed upon us the responsibility of providing for the education of young men, welcome such influences as come forth from this Conference. The young men who are now going through our universities are soon to take a large part in guiding the affairs of the state. If world-arbitration is to come, it will be largely through their influence. We welcome, then, such a centre of influence as this, which helps to educate them in the thought that world-arbitration is sure to prevail.

If we who are here can know the corner-stones upon which this structure of world-arbitration is to be builded up, and if we can make the thoughtful people of the nation know them, then we have done much toward attaining the great object which is before us. To my mind, it is not an edifice that is to be builded up very speedily. I can hardly dream of the time coming within my generation when we shall have more than a few of the nations of the earth joining in the arbitration of their differences. But if we can help to forward it in little measure, we shall have done what we could.

For my part, I would have this Conference teach the citizens of America, I would have all the universities and colleges teach the young men within their walls, to favor the concentration of the control of mankind in a comparatively few world-powers. As I read history, the great advances towards settling disputes by arbitration instead of by war have been through the gathering of clans into states, and states into nations, and nations into empires. What has put away war from the island of Great Britain, these three hundred years? The bringing of Scotland and Wales and England into one nation. What has prevented any intestine war in Germany, among those little kingdoms and principalities these last thirty years? The forming of the German Empire. What has prevented any war in this North American continent, these last thirty years? Very largely, the fact that, north of the southern boundary of Mexico, there are only three nations. There has been ten times more war among those little nations south of Mexico than in all the rest of this continent.

And so, if there come an opportunity by which the United States or its citizens can help place all South America under two governments only, one on the eastern slope of the Andes and the other on the western, or all Central America in a single state, I believe by so doing we shall help forward immeasurably this cause of arbitration. I welcome the coming control of the Dark Continent by three or four world-powers. The covering over of eastern Asia by the Celestial Empire has done uncounted good to mankind in the cause of peace for centuries past. As to the future, I am only sure that either the nations of the world must keep the Celestial Empire in her integrity as a single nation with its three or four hundred millions, or else, if that cannot be done, that the great world-powers of Russia, Germany, England, France must still further enlarge their control of mankind by

taking the millions of that empire, as England took the millions of India, under their protection.

We are to welcome, in the second place, industrial and commercial advance, as an immeasurable step toward arbitration. Bailey Jarvis, in "Rob Roy," discussing the prospects of an outbreak by the Highlanders and consequent civil war in Great Britain, tells how it is that, because a "mooty" of the people in the Highlands have absolutely no work to do, and very little to eat, war is sure to come. To a great many of the nations of the Old World, there is an excuse for the maintenance of standing armies, that otherwise the labor market would be overstocked and there would be nothing for tens of thousands of their citizens to do. I do not believe this doctrine, though temporarily it might seem to be so in Germany, in France, or in Russia. But the most thorough students of economics tell us that invention and commerce, instead of taking the bread out of people's mouths, will, if they are wisely directed, enlarge the wants of the average man, multiply indefinitely the cravings of the masses, and so give employment instead of taking it away. When we help on the spread of commerce, the enlargement of invention and industry, we are giving occupation to mankind. The men, therefore, who have the shaping of the industries and commerce of our country are tending to give that occupation to mankind which will make war unprofitable and after a while impossible. * * * * *

Then may I name the works of education? For, after all, it is some individual, some intelligence, some great will, that at the proper juncture, will see how to use the opportunity which arises and to carry forward to realization this ideal of a great tribunal for mankind. It will always require men "who have understanding of the times." So I rely very largely upon the right use of education, in college and university, in order to raise up a host of educated youth who will resolve that arbitration is to be the solution of the relations between nations, and that it must and shall come. If we can fill the young men of our country with this spirit, with the resolve to work, as they shape our legislation, our industries, our national growth, to secure this world-tribunal, who can tell what a power might go forth over all lands? The day is passed when the educated young man of America is a citizen of America only. He is a citizen of the uttermost parts of the earth.

The Growth of International Unity.

BY PROF. EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN, OF COLUMBIA
UNIVERSITY.

Mr. President, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—There are one or two considerations which appeal strongly to the economist in this discussion. If we take a broad view of history, we find that there has often been a movement in advance, and then in part a reaction. All progress in the world consists of these steps forward, and of perhaps slighter steps backward. From the economic point of view, the world's history may be divided into periods. If we consider the mediaeval conception of the relation of man to the state, we shall find primarily the principle of authority. The individual was nothing; the government was paramount and all-pervading. The government interfered in everything, limited the energies of everyone,

fixed wages and prices, and left almost no scope to individual initiative.

Then came, after several centuries, the modern view which was initiated through the great industrial revolution of the eighteenth century, and for which we in America have stood more than any other nation. This is the movement of individualism, which rests upon the theory of free competition and of personal initiative. Worked out first by the great writers of the eighteenth century, it has found its greatest practical realization in this country, because of the boundless continent which we have had to conquer and because of the consequent need of individual energy in coping with the difficulties of the situation.

Now, in modern times we have seen a reaction, a necessary reaction, a reaction due largely to the very causes which have been adverted to by some of the speakers to-night. We have found that individual initiative, cut loose from any control from above, means, in great measure, the abuse of the one by the other; means the power of the strong individual to succeed, the fate of the weak individual to succumb. The trend of thought at the end of the nineteenth century, as it will be more strongly the trend of thought in the twentieth century, is to effect a compromise between these two legitimate principles, of individualism on the one hand, and (using the word in its widest sense) of socialism on the other. What the world is tending to, in other words, is the socialization of private initiative, the keeping of what is good and true and fruitful in private initiative, but the harnessing of the individual to the yoke of society.

Now let us apply this thought to the problem in hand. If we take a similarly broad view of the development of political life, we find that there also has been going on a flux and a reflux. In early times, there was no such thing as a nation. A man was a citizen of a town. A foreigner was not alone a stranger from another country; the man who came from another village was equally a foreigner. It made no difference to the merchants of York whether a "foreigner" came from an English town or from a Flemish or an Italian or a German town; all alike were foreigners. But in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries there came a great epoch of nation-building, stimulated by the great industrial development of the age. This growth of nations paved the way for the beginnings of international law. If I mistake not, it was through the meetings at Augsburg and Westphalia that nations for the first time came together to agree upon certain international principles.

Now in the eighteenth century there came a wider and broader movement, not alone in politics, but in philosophy, in economics, nay in every phase of human thought. It was the idea which lay at the bottom of the theories of the French philosophers and encyclopedists, the idea which was the basis of the doctrines of Rousseau and the other political reformers, the idea which really paved the way for the economic doctrines of the Physiocrats, the idea, namely, of a world-state. Let us have no more nations, said they; let us merge the nation into a universal state, the universal republic. Patriotism is antiquated, patriotism is immoral; we will have no more patriotism, we will have only the love of the individual for the Creator. Natural rights are broader than the domain of any one state. That was the doctrine which led to the French Revolution; and it was from many points of view, a noble

doctrine and constituted a real advance in civilization.

But here again the nineteenth century, especially the end of the nineteenth century, has witnessed another and a necessary reaction. What we want is not the giving up of nationality, not an abandonment of patriotism, not the merging of the nation in the whole, but the blending of the one nation with this greater international unity. What we desire is to keep alive all those forces which make for a true and upright spirit of nationality, but to discourage the ignoble, the selfish forces which only make for a false nationality.

From the economic point of view there is another thought which is important in this discussion. We economists have been accustomed to teach, now for many a year, that liberty is indeed a divine thing, but that there can be no true liberty without a real equality; an equality, indeed, only of opportunity, for there is no such thing as equality of power or of intellect. What does international arbitration mean? It means that we are applying to the political world this economic conception of the blending of liberty and equality. Liberty without equality, as between nations, would mean swallowing up of the weaker nations, even though there be some reason for their continuance, by the stronger ones. Liberty with equality means that when a nation feels that it has justice behind it it is no longer weak, but has become strong. Therefore international arbitration, as any movement which tends in this direction, conduces to the maintenance of an important force which makes for progress and creates civilization.

Therefore, it is that we must all welcome such conferences as this. When a pebble is dropped into a lonely lake by our side, we see the little ripple gradually giving its impulse to others, until we have a whole series of concentric circles. Let us hope that this Conference and its successors may act like the pebble and that this wave of noble resolve and high aim may flow out into the wider ocean of public opinion, until the ever widening circles shall ultimately embrace the entire thinking part of our population, and we shall finally achieve what we all so fervently have at heart.

An International Court.

BY HON. ROBERT EARL, FORMERLY CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COURT OF APPEALS OF NEW YORK.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,—The enthusiasm which has been manifested here, and the hope that has been expressed for the cause of arbitration, have encouraged and inspired me, as no doubt they have every one present. I agree mainly with what has been said, and I firmly believe that in the future the cause which we all have at heart will certainly triumph. But I go further, and make what may be to some a surprising announcement, that the cause of arbitration is already triumphant. The conscience of the civilized world has been so educated and stimulated by the influences which have emanated from these conferences, by the peace conferences held in other parts of our country and in Europe, and by what has been said in the great schools of learning, in the halls of legislation and in the public press, that I confidently believe that there will be no war in the future among civilized nations over any dispute which could be fairly said to be a subject for arbitration.

Indeed, there has been no war in very recent times, so